DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 205 FL 023 005

AUTHOR Gilroy, Marie
TITLE An Investigation into Teachers' Attitudes to Using Literature in the Language Classroom.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 19p.; For complete volume, see FL 023 004.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics; n6 p1-17 1995

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; Educational Needs; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interviews; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Literature Appreciation; Native Speakers; Second Language Instruction; *Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS University of Edinburgh (Scotland)

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the thoughts and feelings of teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL) concerning use of literature appreciation as a strategy for second language teaching. Subjects were 20 native-English-speaking teachers of a variety of courses at the University of Edinburgh (Scotland) Institute for Applied Language Studies. In interviews, the teachers were asked what background knowledge, skills, and qualities are required to exploit this resource effectively, and whether any specialized training in the teaching of literature is needed. Results show that while many of the teachers did not feel the need for a specialized course in literature for ESL, most would welcome more background knowledge to increase their confidence in handling literary texts. The report examines reasons for this and concludes with some suggestions for teacher development in this area. (Contains 11 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 205

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Parkinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

An Investigation Into Teachers' Attitudes to Using Literature in the Language Classroom

Marie Gilroy (IALS)

102 3005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN INVESTIGATION INTO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TO USING LITERATURE IN THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

Marie Gilroy (IALS)

Abstract

This paper reports on teachers' attitudes to the use of literature in the EFL classroom. The study was designed to explore teachers' thoughts and feelings about using this resource given its increasing prominence in published materials, in particular to find out what background knowledge, skills and qualities are required to exploit the resource effectively and whether any specialist training in the teaching of literature is needed. To explore this, an interview schedule was drawn up and interviews conducted with 20 teachers on various courses at IALS. It was found that although many of the teachers did not feel the need for a specialist course in literature for EFL, most of them would welcome more background knowledge to increase their confidence in handling literary text. The paper examines the reasons for this and concludes with some suggestions for teacher development in this area.

1. Introduction

After a long absence, literature has made a comeback into many EFL classrooms, having been expelled along with the grammar-translation method. Structural, functional and notional approaches seemed to find no place for literature, but in recent years it has become difficult to ignore it, appearing as it does in so many published materials.

Many reasons for introducing literature into the communicative language teaching syllabus have been put forward. Collie and Slater (1987) suggest four main reasons: that it offers valuable authentic material, cultural enrichment, language enrichment and personal involvement. Similarly, Carter and Long (1991) categorise the reasons under three headings, namely, the cultural model, the language model and the personal growth model, each of which embraces a particular set of learning objectives for students. As well as providing motivating material, literature also helps to develop students' interpretative abilities (Lazar 1993). Duff and Maley (1990) point out the authenticity and seriousness of literary texts, which offer genuine samples of a very wide range of styles, registers and text-types dealing with non-trivial matters to which learners can bring a personal response from their own experience. They also note that because literary texts are open to multiple interpretations, this provides 'a ready-made opinion gap between one individual's interpretation and another's' which 'can be bridged by genuine interaction'. (1990: 6) To these considerations can be added Ezra Pound's statement that 'Literature is news that STAYS news' (1951:29), which highlights the enduring quality of literature as well as the fact that it can provide a convenient source of material for teachers which does not become stale in the way that yesterday's news can.

However, in spite of all these praiseworthy reasons, it seems that literature presents a problem for many language teachers who voice concern about introducing it into the classroom. In their introductions to teachers' and students' books which make use of literature, several authors have shown themselves to be aware of teachers' attitudes, as some of the following remarks show.

According to Duff and Maley, 'teachers and students view poetry with feelings ranging from slight misgivings to downright dislike' (1989:6). Collie and Slater ask whether we should be teaching literature in the foreign language classroom at a pre-university level, or not. 'This is a question which is certainly at the forefront of debate today, yet it remains controversial and the attitude of many teachers ambivalent' (1987:1-2). Carter and Long have noted in recent years 'an uneasy relationship between the teaching of English language and the teaching of English literature' (1987: 2-3), while John McRae states that:

> Many language teachers have told me that they feel inadequate when faced with 'literature', either because they have no 'literary' qualification or because they have not studied literature since their university days. Others leap in enthusiastically because they enjoyed studying literature because they read a lot, or because it seems like fun. (1991:9)

He cites several comments from teachers:

> 'I'm not a literature person.'
> 'I don't know anything about literature.'
> 'I'm not into that sort of thing.'

which, he says, leads to a kind of 'Who's afraid of *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* ' (1991:9).

Apart from this anecdotal evidence, it would seem that little, if any, research into teachers' attitudes to using literature in the language classroom has been undertaken. Informal staffroom discussions with colleagues have also revealed what might be termed a sense of unease about using literature in the language classroom. I personally am enthusiastic about literature, which I believe provides a valuable resource in EFL. Not only can it be used to expand students' awareness of language by exposing them to many varieties of English, it can provide a stimulus for language acquisition in terms of vocabulary development and the internalising of grammar patterns. In the form of creative and imaginative stimulus, it encourages students to give their own response which they can discuss with others. However, the sense of unease some teachers appear to feel towards the use of literature provided the motivation for this study.

2. Aims

The aim of this study was to explore EFL teachers' attitudes to, and present practices in, using literature as a resource, including whether they consider that any special training is needed and what background knowledge, skills and qualities they think would help to exploit this resource effectively. Teachers were also asked to reflect on the nature of literary language and how it differs from other language varieties.

3. Research Procedure

The survey of teachers' attitudes was conducted by means of an interview schedule and involved 20 participants.

3.1 Sample

The convenience sample of 20 native speaker teachers included 15 permanent and temporary staff members at IALS, two PhD candidates at the Department of Applied Linguistics (DAL), and three candidates on a 10-week RSA/DTEFLA teacher training course at IALS.

In order to include as wide a range of teachers as possible, the teachers were selected according to their first degree qualification to include a variety of academic backgrounds, i.e. not only in English literature and/or language. Some of these teachers had also voiced apprehensions about using literature in the

language classroom. However, I tried to exclude those teachers associated with literature courses and who were reasonably confident about it, as I thought that more useful data could be gathered from those teachers who felt less confident.

3.2 Interview schedule

An interview schedule divided into three sections and including open-ended and single answer questions was drawn up. (See Appendices 1 and 2.)

Section 1: Academic and literary background was designed to find out about the respondents' qualifications and reading habits.

Section 2: Use of literature in the language classroom included questions about how often respondents used literature as a resource, types of texts and activities used, the purpose of using literature in the language class and what background knowledge, skills and qualities they thought were needed/would be useful. A checklist of skills, qualities and background knowledge was compiled from books dealing with how to teach literature as well as from the introductions to books for students. This checklist was only used when the respondent needed a prompt to answer this question.
Respondents were also asked to comment on the nature of literary language and whether it differs from other uses of language.

Section 3: The literary 'quiz' (Appendix 2) was adapted from Lazar (1993). In the first part, respondents were asked to match terms with definitions and then match them with literary examples as a way of finding out how familiar teachers were with literary terminology and how they felt about it. In no way was it intended to suggest that the ability to identify literary tropes affected a teacher's ability to handle texts in the language classroom. The second part involved identifying which of six texts could be classified as 'literary', and respondents were asked to give reasons whenever possible. The purpose of this was to explore teachers' ideas about the nature of literary language and how these might influence their use of literary texts.

3.3 Interview Procedure

The interviews were conducted by the researcher using the interview schedule, noting down answers as far as possible in the respondent's own words, and checking, in the case of summarising a respondent's answer, that it reflected as accurately as possible his/her thoughts and feelings. The interviews were not recorded because of time restrictions. Respondents were not given the opportunity to read through the questions before the interview and in the case of misunderstandings I allowed myself to reformulate when necessary. For example, when help was need to answer question 2.6 in Section 2, 'What do you think would help a teacher in exploitation of literary texts in the language classroom?', the checklist was produced as a prompt. It can usually be seen from the wording of the answers to this question which respondents required prompting as they tended to used terms similar to those on the checklist.

It was thought that more valuable information could be collected in this way rather than asking a larger number of teachers to complete a questionnaire. However, this method of conducting interviews does suffer from a certain amount of researcher effect as teachers may try to give an answer which they think the interviewer wants or which may impress the interviewer, especially if they feel uneasy about literature. Respondents usually did the quiz directly after the interview on their own but, in one or two cases, because of insufficient time, the respondent was allowed to take the quiz away to complete and was asked to promise not to cheat.

Throughout the interview it was stressed to the teachers taking part that I was interested in their attitudes towards using literature as a resource in a language classroom in which the main aim is language improvement, and not 'literature through language' where the main aim is the study of literature.

4. Selective Summary of Findings

Because of the large amount of data collected, in this paper I will attempt to focus on those findings which relate to the main objectives as well as anything which I felt to be particularly surprising, interesting or disappointing.

Section 1: Academic and literary background

Respondents were asked about their educational qualifications. Only one out of the 20 respondents had no higher degree qualifications and limited experience in EFL. Some also had ESL experience and qualifications. Because the sample was limited to teachers working at IALS, it does not include teachers with less than two years teaching experience whose answers might have altered the findings. A high proportion (14) had higher degrees or qualifications.

Section 2: Use of literature in the language classroom

Q2. Have you ever used literary texts (poetry, extracts from novels, short stories) as a resource in the language classroom?

All of the respondents said that they had used literature as a resource at some point in their teaching career. Their choice of literary texts was rather diverse, ranging from the poetry of R.S. Thomas and Lewis Carroll (*Jabberwocky*), through horror (*Dracula*) and travel (*A Year in Provence*) to a novel in translation (*The Name of the Rose*).

Many comments revealed a feeling of uncertainty about what could be classified as literature. One teacher said 'I don't really know what literature is', and another wondered whether a song could be classified as a literary text. At this stage in the interview, respondents were not asked to consider a definition of literature and literary language (which comes in Section 3), although, with hindsight, it might have been more useful to have asked them to do so at this point.

Q2.1 When did you last use a literary text?

In response to this question, answers ranged from 'four years ago' to 'this week'. Some teachers pointed out that although they would like to exploit this resource more often, their teaching schedule dictated otherwise, e.g. they were teaching ESP or had to follow a syllabus.

Q2.3 Why did you use it?

Seventeen out of 20 teachers answered because they themselves had wanted to use it, five because it came up in the textbook and only one because students asked for it. 'For variety' was one reason given, other teachers used it to provoke discussion, some as a change from their course book or course syllabus and one to illustrate a language point. It is surprising that only one teacher mentioned its cultural dimension, since in Question 3.6, when asked about the purposes of using literature, seven teachers mentioned cultural background and awareness.

The fact that only one teacher had responded to students' request for literature would seem to raise at least two questions concerning the nature of teacher sensitivity and learner choice:

1. Do teachers force literature upon students because they think it is good for them?
2. Do students not request literature because they think that:
    a. it is too difficult
    b. not appropriate
    c. or simply because it has not occurred to them to ask?

Although it is beyond the scope of this study to look at students' responses to literature, such questions merit further investigation.

Q2.5 Were you satisfied with the way it went?

Can you rate your reaction on this cline.

5	4	3	2	1
very satisfied				**not satisfied**

In response to this question, 17 were very satisfied and three fairly satisfied. Eight of the 17 were unreserved about their level of satisfaction, with one teacher explaining that her own enthusiasm had been transferred to the students. It is interesting to note that a teacher who rated satisfaction at 4 on the cline then commented that one half of the class thought 'it was great', the other half rejected the activity. Another teacher, who also gave a rating of 4-5, mentioned that one student's lack of interest was due to 'her attitude problem'. According to this teacher, the student (Japanese) would not make the effort. Interestingly enough another teacher noted 'panic' from one Japanese student in response to a literature activity, while the rest of the class seemed to like it.

Some of the comments seem to point to a discrepancy between teacher perception of satisfaction and learner perception. It would have been interesting to examine the composition of nationalities within the class to find out which nationalities enjoyed the activity, but since the research was aimed at teachers' attitudes, the question of students' attitudes was not followed up.

Researcher effect should be taken into consideration when analysing the answers to Q2.5 as teachers may not want to appear inadequate and admit failure. With hindsight, respondents could have been asked whether they would use the same activity again with a similar class to get round the 'fear of failure' problem. This question also relates to Q2.3 (Why did you use it?) in answer to which 17 said because they, the teacher, wanted to; and also question 2.4, in response to which 15 said they had designed the activities themselves. This would suggest a high level of personal investment perhaps, and a strong desire on the part of the teachers for it to go well - and some of the comments (see above) would also support this. It would be interesting to compare the use of a non-literary extract to that of a literary one, with similar activities and tasks, to determine whether teacher satisfaction was higher or lower.

Q2.6 What do you think would help a teacher in exploiting texts in the language classroom?
e.g. biographical information about a writer.

The checklist was divided into skills, background knowledge and qualities. (See Appendix 3.) Under the heading Skills, nine respondents mentioned EFL teaching skills as being useful and two commented that teaching skills for exploiting literature were not much different from EFL skills, while one said that once a teacher had ideas on how to exploit a text in general, she didn't see a literary text as being much different from any other text.

The role of the teacher was given high priority. Nine respondents considered the teacher's role as motivator, especially with regard to the selection of texts, as important, seven mentioned the role of teacher as enabler or facilitator, that is helping the reader to understand the text, and seven mentioned the teacher's role as a bridge or link by finding ways of connecting the experience of the learner with the literary work.

Almost all the teachers (17) said that background knowledge would be useful in helping them to exploit a literary text. Among the areas mentioned were biographical information about a writer, general literary history and theory, literary stylistics and knowledge of other aspects of the literary tradition. The reasons given for the need for more background knowledge reveal some of the fears and apprehensions that teachers may have such as the 'embarrassment felt when students think of one meaning and you haven't'; nervousness brought on by the teacher not liking a text which, as a result, 'won't go well'. The general feeling that background knowledge would increase teacher confidence would suggest a discrepancy between what teachers say is necessary and what they feel to be helpful in exploiting literary texts.

Although many would affirm that EFL teaching skills are sufficient, they also state that they would feel more confident, more at ease with more background information including knowledge of literary terminology.

Under 'qualities', enthusiasm was mentioned by six respondents with the qualification that it be tempered with restraint. Other qualities which could be classified under the general heading of enthusiasm were conviction, an interest in literature and a love of the text.

In response to Q2.6, most of the respondents expressed a certain amount of confidence in handling literary texts as a resource, seeing them as no different from other language teaching materials. The high level of satisfaction expressed in Question 2.5 would tend to support this.

Q 3.4 What purposes does the use of literature in the language classroom have?

From responses given to Question 2.6 in which respondents stated that they regarded literature as just another resource, it could be supposed that the majority of teachers might see language improvement as the main purpose of using literature, and the evidence seems to support this view.

The most frequently mentioned purposes included the promotion of further reading and the use of literature as a stimulus for discussion, mentioned by nine respondents. Six considered literature useful for illustrating grammar points and six would introduce it as another variety of discourse. One teacher mentioned using literature to point out 'good examples of English', although this might also be implicit in other respondents' answers e.g. as a model and/or stimulus for creative writing. Five considered it a good source of authentic material to 'elicit an authentic response.'

It is not surprising, given the focus on language learning, that increasing students' literary awareness, that is to say of how a writer achieves certain effects, did not rank very highly among the teachers. However, seven teachers pointed to the use of literature for the purposes of 'cultural awareness-raising,' or 'cultural appreciation', which would reveal the importance of non-linguistic purposes for the use of literature.

Q2.7 Do you think any special training is required to use literary texts?

Another main objective of the research was to find out if teachers thought that they needed any special training in using literature in the language classroom. It was supposed that educational background and qualifications might affect this response.

Of the seven who said 'Yes', three had a background in English Language and Literature, two in Modern Languages and Literature and two in various other specialities. It was expected that a higher proportion with a background in Languages and Literature and the one respondent with no higher degree qualifications would have considered a training course to be necessary. Of the eight who responded 'It depends', two main factors were mentioned, the individual teacher's personality and background, and the approach. That is to say, if a teacher was sufficiently well-read and enthusiastic, and the approach was language through literature and not literature through language, then a training course was not deemed necessary. In one teacher's view, since literature was only a small part of the language class the teacher could read books on how to deal with it.

Of the five who answered 'No', the main reason given was that literature as a resource was not much different from other texts. The teacher with no higher-degree qualifications but with an RSA Certificate, who might be supposed to have felt more in need of a course, commented that although special training may help, it is more important that a teacher is reasonably well-read and has an interest in the subject. Looking in more detail at this teacher, it can be seen that she spends one hour a day reading for enjoyment and mentioned literary fiction, history, biographies and newspapers under 'what read'. Although she had five years experience in EFL, this had been sporadic and had taken place mainly in one-to-one teaching situations.

In answering this question, respondents were at pains to differentiate between using literature as a resource and teaching literature "as literature". Many said that a special training course was not necessary for literature as a resource, but would be useful for the study of literature as literature.

It was surprising that a higher proportion did not say that special training was necessary, but this may be a reflection of the sample chosen to be interviewed. Less qualified, less experienced teachers may be more likely to express such a need. However, on closer examination, their comments, especially concerning literary background and stylistics, would suggest a desire for some kind of training, although not concentrating on EFL skills.

Section 3: Literary quiz

Most respondents were wary about being asked to complete the third section of the interview schedule, the literary quiz, which many said they perceived as threatening, a "test" of their literary knowledge and literary competence. Respondents were assured that knowledge of literary terminology was only a small part in the armoury of an EFL teacher using literature and told not to worry if they got the answers wrong. The point of including the quiz was to evaluate their feelings towards literary terminology and the examples from Lazar (1993), it was explained, offered a fairly clear-cut list.

The only respondent who felt quite at ease, scoring 10 out of 10 after matching the terms with definitions, commented 'Everyone should know what they mean, shouldn't they?' since this was her experience. However, when it came to matching the terms/definitions with the examples (question 2), she scored 7 out of 10.

Some respondents stated that, whereas in the first part of the question they could arrive at the correct answers by a process of elimination, it was more difficult to do so in the second part where they were asked to identify examples of figures of speech.

The greatest confusion seemed to be the difference between metaphor and metonymy, but this is not surprising. Metonymy is generally not well-known and is 'frequently confused with two other figures of speech, metaphor and synecdoche' (Pankhurst 1994), and there are many cases where the terms overlap, leading to ambiguity (Parkinson 1993). Those who had never come across the terms synecdoche, oxymoron, or apostrophe, were interested to know the definitions as well as their score.

One teacher commented that she would like to know the terms as a useful shorthand for teaching literature. Another stated that it is essential to know the concepts but not the terms.

Q3 Here are a number of different texts. Read through each one and decide whether or not you think it is a literary text. If not, then think about where the text might have come from. Note down any language in the text which helped you to make your decision.

This task, again taken from Lazar (1993) was designed to explore teachers' ideas on identifying and defining literary texts. Lazar claims that 'one of the hallmarks of literature is that it feeds creatively on every possible style and register' (1993:6). In fact, when asked to identify which texts were literary, two respondents questioned whether it was possible to do so. One teacher commented that it was difficult to say because anything can be used by writers of literature to add meaning to established styles of writing. According to another, any of them could have come from a literary text, although she added that some of them use richer language than that used in newspaper articles.

The significance of these remarks was shown in the answers given by the others in categorizing the text in question 3-B. One thought it came from 'a junk romance', whereas another thought it was 'bad style', at the same time conceding that 'that does not mean it could not be by a serious writer'. In support of their view that 3-B was a literary text, 16 teachers pointed out the high frequency of metaphors and similes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

However, text 3-C was identified by 13 as non-literary because of the use of 'flowery language', the same reason given by another three teachers for it being categorised as 'literary'.

Although some respondents expressed deep uncertainties, there was a considerable consensus in the answers they finally gave as to what could be regarded as "literary".

5. General Conclusions

One surprising conclusion from this investigation is that, despite voicing concerns informally about using literature in the language classroom, when questioned more formally, many of the EFL teachers in this study said that they regarded literature as a resource no different from any other EFL resource. Most of the respondents said that they felt confident about using literature when applying EFL-style tasks and activities. No doubt this is because, with one exception, the respondents were highly-qualified, experienced EFL teachers. Yet at the same time they acknowledge the usefulness of such factors as background information or knowledge of stylistics to give them confidence in case they are asked non-linguistic questions. This would suggest that, in spite of their outward confidence, they do have some misgivings.

Another factor to be taken into consideration is that all of the teachers interviewed tended to use literary extracts as one-off, filler-type activities which, although designed to tie in with the current topic or course, seemed to be considered more of "an added extra". None of the teachers interviewed seemed to use literature on a regular basis, as an integral part of the syllabus. Although many said they would like to, syllabus restrictions made this difficult. Most of the texts described were short - poems or extracts - often studied out of context, and none of the teachers mentioned using longer texts such as plays or novels with a class. This rather limited use of literature might explain why teachers feel relatively confident, since there would be less likelihood of being asked awkward questions by students.

It is also surprising that more teachers did not mention, as one teacher did, that literary texts often require more careful reading and more preparation than non-literary ones, and this may be one of the reasons why the teachers interviewed did not exploit the resource more often. It is disappointing that so few seem to include literary texts regularly in their teaching. As one teacher pointed out, if more literature were used, it would 'lose its mystique'. Timetable and syllabus restrictions, however, often made this impossible. Despite these findings, there seemed to be a general feeling that, given the opportunity, the greater use of literature in language teaching was desirable.

Although the level of enthusiasm for extended teacher development courses on literature in language teaching is surprisingly low among the teachers in this study, it would also seem that most of them would accept that there is a body of knowledge, namely literary history, theory and stylistics as well as biographical and background information about writers, which would inform their use of literature in the language classroom. The explanation for this apparent discrepancy is not totally clear from this data but one may speculate that, because of the limited role literature plays in their present teaching, their repertoire of teaching techniques is at present sufficient.

Although I reluctantly conclude that there is no clear evidence to support the introduction of extensive teacher development or training courses with the population researched, given the increasing prominence of literature it would seem that teachers would be receptive to more modest input such as seminars and workshop sessions which, rather than dealing with EFL-type tasks and activities, would focus more on literary stylistics and analysis.

However, the results of this investigation influenced the design of a summer course at IALS, 'Teaching Literature in EFL', which included sessions on current literary theories.

References

Carter R. and M.N. Long. 1991. Teaching Literature Harlow: Longman.

Carter R. and M.N. Long. 1987. The Web of Words: Teacher's Book. Cambridge: CUP.

Collie J. and S. Slater. 1987. Literature in the Language Classroom. Cambridge: CUP

Duff. A. and A. Maley. 1990 Literature. Oxford: OUP.

Hill, D. A. (ed.) 1993. Changing Contexts in English Language Teaching. Milan: British Council.

Lazar G. 1993. Literature and Language Teaching Cambridge: CUP.

McRae J. 1991. Literature with a Small 'l'. London: Macmillan MEP.

Maley A. and A. Duff. 1989. The Inward Ear. Cambridge: CUP.

Pankhurst A. 1994. 'Interpreting Metonymy'. EWPAL 5: 98-108.

Parkinson, B.L. 1993. 'Missed Metaphors'. In Hill (ed.) 1993:107-112.

Pound E. 1951. ABC of Reading, London: Faber and Faber.

Appendix 1
Teachers' Attitudes to Using Literature in the Language Classroom
Interview Schedule

Section 1 Academic / Literary Background

1. What is your first degree?

English Literature ☐
English Literature and Language ☐
English Language / Linguistics ☐
Modern Languages ☐
Modern Languages and Literature ☐
Other (please specify) ☐

2. Do you have any other qualifications?

DTEFLA ☐
MA/MSc in Applied Linguistics ☐
MLitt ☐
PhD ☐
PGCE ☐
Other ☐

3. Personal Reading Habits

3.1 Approximately how many hours do you read per week? less than 5 _____
more than 5 _____
more than 10 _____

a) for work purposes _____
b) for enjoyment _____

3.2 What do you read for enjoyment? _____

What was the name of the last novel/biography/etc. you completed reading?

_____
_____

When was thät? _____

4. Do your personal reading habits affect your approach to literature in the language classroom? Please comment.

_____

_____

_____

Section 2 Use of Literature in the Language Classroom

1. How long have you been teaching EFL? _____

2. Have you ever used literary texts (poetry, extracts from novels, short stories) as a resource in the language classroom? Yes ☐ No ☐
If **NO** go to question 3
If **YES**,

2.1 when did you last use a literary text? _____

2.2 where did you take the text from? Give source. _____

2.3 why did you use it? _____

a) came up in textbook/course
b) students asked for it
c) you wanted to use it
d) any other reason? _____

2.4 Did you design the activities? _____
Did you use commercially prepared material? _____

2.5 Were you satisfied with the way it went? _____

Can you rate your reaction on this cline.

5	4	3	2	1
very satisfied				not at all satisfied

Please comment on the activities the class did based on the text:

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.6 What do you think would help a Teacher in exploiting literary texts in the language classroom?e.g. biographical information about a writer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Could you rank these in order of importance?

_____

_____

_____

2.7 Do you think any special training is required to use literary texts? _____

_____

3. 3.1 Why do you not use literary texts in the language classroom?

_____

_____

_____

3.2 What would you say are the differences between the language of jokes, riddles, slogans, proverbs, idioms, newspaper articles/headlines reviews, travel writing and that in novels, short stories, poetry etc?
Please comment.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.3 What background knowledge, teaching skills and qualities do you think would help a Teacher to use literature effectively in the language classroom?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Could you rank these in order of importance?

_____

_____

_____

3.4 What purposes does the use of literature in the language classroom have?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Section 3 Literary Competence (Test)

1. Can you match the following terms with the definition?
2. Can you match the term with the examples?
3. Which of the texts would you say was 'literary'?
4. What helped you make your choice?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix 2
Extracts from "quiz" - See Lazar 1993:5-6 and 44-45 for complete original version.

Below is a list of some of the terms which are often used when discussing literature. In fact some of them are terms for figures of speech which are equally common in everyday language. Can you define them or give an example?

1. Metaphor
2. Simile
3. Personification
4. Paradox
5. Oxymoron
6. Metonymy
7. Synecdoche
8. Apostrophe
9. Alliteration
10. Assonance

Here are the 'text-book' definitions. Can you match them with the term?

a) a kind of metaphor in which abstract or inanimate objects are described as if they were alive and animate.

b) a combination of neighbouring words which seem apparently contradictory or incongruous.

c) the repetition of identical or similar vowel sounds, usually in the middle of words.

(plus seven more examples)

Now can you match the terms and definitions with the following examples?

Examples

A. '...with the smoking blueness of Pluto's gloom...' (D.H. Lawrence, *Bavarian Gentians*.)

B. 'War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength.' (George Orwell, *1984*.)

C. 'The pen is mightier than the sword.' (E.G. Bulwer-Lytton, *Richelieu*, II, 2, 1938.)

(plus seven more examples)

Appendix 2
(cont.) (p.2)

Task 6

Here are a number of different texts. Read through each one and decide whether or not you think it is a literary text. If not, then think about where the text might have come from. Note down any language in the text which helped you to make your decision.

A. As this is a small Edwardian terraced house with limited natural light, Venetian blinds were chosen to cover the windows. They screen the street scene during the day and add to the impression of space given by the light walls and modern furniture. Curtains in deep coral would have looked heavy, but the sunshine that streams through the blinds keeps the overall effect light.

B. The windows were ajar and gleaming white against the fresh grass outside that seemed to grow a little way into the house. A breeze blew through the room, blew curtains in at one end and out the other like pale flags, twisting them up toward the frosted wedding-cake of the ceiling, and then rippled over the wine-coloured rug, making a shadow on it as the wind does at sea.

C. His breast of chicken with tarragon and girolles goes back to the classic French repertoire: the skin of the fowl crisped to gold, odoriferously swathed in a thick creamy sauce, golden also, piled with fleshy mushrooms fried in butter till they take on the gleam of varnished wood.

D. Just because we're deaf, it doesn't mean we've nothing between our ears.

(plus three more examples)

Appendix 3
Teachers' Attitudes to Using Literature in the Language Classroom
Checklist of skills, qualities and knowledge

Role/skills

1. Teacher as enabler, facilitator, intermediary - to help bring out Ss responses, help Ss unravel many meanings in a text.

2. T as bridge, link - between literary text and Ss own experience, i.e. activate experience, prompt comparisons, contrasts.

3. T as motivator - i.e. find suitable texts, motivate Ss to read.

4. Ability to:

    - devise appropriate tasks, approaches
    - set up process, procedures
    - ask appropriate questions
    - formulate points of view for discussion

    (strategies not different from language teaching?)

5. Ability to read aloud and decide when suitable for students to read aloud.

6. Ability to predict, anticipate Ss problems - e.g. language, grammar.

7. Ability to predict cross cultural factors - the curious and inexplicable.

8. Ability to distinguish appropriate response, i.e. valid and ability to refute invalid interpretations.

9. Ability to follow another T's notes.

10. Awareness of reading processes.

Qualities

1. Enthusiasm (but not too much!).

2. Restraint - not impose own interpretation

3. a. sensitivity - having feeling - response to text, heightened awareness
   b. sensibility - having appreciation, easily affected, aware, having good judgement

4. Discipline - to stop students going on flights of fancy.

5. Patience - to wait for Ss to come up with own interpretations, help through difficult patches.

Appendix 3
(cont.) (p.2)

Knowledge

1. Background knowledge - T as resource for historical and cultural background information.

2. Knowledge of current literary theories.

3. Knowledge of other aspects of literary tradition.

4. Terminology - stylistics training, metalanguage i.e. ability to define metaphors etc.

5. Knowledge of grammar in widest sense (linguistic competence)

    - use of English
    - analytic competence
    - literary competence

Literary competence

Defined as having:

> *...an implicit understanding of and familiarity with certain conventions which allow us to take the words on a page and convert them into literary meaning.*
> (Culler's definition paraphrased by Lazar, 1993, p 12)

includes:

1. ability to infer a message, recognise patterns of language
2. ability to rate a text on cline - evaluate, judge
3. ability to deal with the unexpected
4. ability to deal with ambiguity, irony
5. ability to appreciate and understand certain conventions.